



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/854,033	05/11/2001	David A. Monroe	081829.000048	8157

7590 06/16/2005

BRACEWELL & PATTERSON
P.O. Box 61389
Houston, TX 77208-1389

EXAMINER

REKSTAD, ERICK J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2613

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/854,033	Applicant(s) MONROE ET AL.	
	Examiner Erick Rekstad	Art Unit 2613	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This is a first action for application no. 09/854033 filed on May 11, 2001 in response to the amendment filed on January 13, 2005 in which claims 1-44 are presented for examination.

Claim Objections

Claim 11 is objected to because of the following informalities: The claim states "transmitter and is" the claim should state "transmitter and receiver is". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "wireless hub" in line 17 page 17. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claim 1 describes only a hub for receiving the signals and an associated transmitter for transmitting the signals.

Claim 13 recites the limitation "control signal" in claim 9. The "control signal" is claimed in claim 10. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 1, 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,385,772 to Courtney.

[claim 1]

As shown in Figure 1, Courtney teaches a surveillance system (10) having a wireless, portable monitoring module (46) for use in connection with a video/image surveillance system (24, 12, 13 and 19), comprising:

- a. A remote camera for collecting and transmitting digital signals representing video/images in the range of the camera (12 and 13);
- b. A hub for receiving the signals (38);
- c. A transmitter associated with the hub for transmitting the signals via a wireless transmission system (36);
- d. A portable monitoring station having a receiver associated herewith and adapted for receiving the signals transmitted by the transmitter for displaying the signals as a video/image display thereat (48, 46) (Col 1 Line 65-Col 2 Line 5, Col 3 Lines 18-26, Col 4 Lines 3-13 and 27-45).

[claim 2]

As best understood by the examiner, Courtney teaches including a plurality of cameras associated with the hub (12 and 13 in Fig. 1), each of said cameras transmitting a unique signal to the hub and wherein the portable monitoring station is adapted for selecting any of the unique signals (Col 3 Lines 28-40, Col 5 line 52-Col 6 Line 3)

[claim 8]

Courtney teaches the surveillance system of claim 1, further including a server (24, Figure 1) associated with the hub.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-7 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courtney as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of US Patent 6,345,279 to Li et al. and US Patent 6,385,244 to Morad et al.

[claim 3]

Courtney teaches the use of a camera as shown above for claim 1. Courtney teaches the transformation of the images from the camera into viewable images for the portable display (Col 4 Line 59-Col 5 Line 25, Fig. 2). Courtney does not teach the transformation performed within the camera. Courtney further does not teach the portable monitoring station adapted for selecting among the plurality of distinctive signals.

Morad teaches the use of image processing units within a video camera (Col 14 Line 45-Col 15 Line 26, Fig. 12). Morad further teaches the camera contains a video input processor (106) with programmable resolution (SIF, QSIF, and the like) (Col 11 Line 53-Col 12 Line 11, Fig. 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention to combine the camera of Morad with the system of Courtney in order to adjust the resolution of the video. Morad and Courtney do not teach the portable monitoring device adapted for selecting any of the unique signals.

Li teach a transcoding method in which the video output is selected based on the portable monitoring device's capabilities so that the video can be viewed on different devices (Col 2 Lines 20-25, Col 6 Lines 8-41, Fig. 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the system of Morad and Courtney with the transcoding system of Li in order to provide the video to different devices.

[claims 4-7]

Morad teaches the programmable resolution as being SIF or QSIF as required by claims 4 and 5 (Col 12 Lines 10-11). Morad further teaches the encoding step can be JPEG as required by claim 6 (Col 15 Lines 22-26). Morad teaches the video can start as an analog video signal (Col 15 Lines 3-6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the analog video signal as broadcasting of analog video is well known in the art (Official Notice).

[claim 31]

Though Courtney, Li and Morad do not specifically teach an access control signal it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a security means in order to prevent unauthorized users from accessing the images (Official Notice).

Claims 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courtney as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of US Patent 6,675,386 to Hendricks et al.

[claims 9 and 10]

As shown above Courtney teaches the surveillance system of claim 8. The server of Courtney (24, Fig. 1) does not specifically show the server adapted for archiving the signals. As shown in Figure 2, Hendricks teaches the digital storage (132) attached to the server (130) for archiving the signals (Col 6 Lines 38-43). Hendricks further teaches the use of the stored video in order to provide additional information not available in the live video (Col 18 Lines 40-61, Figs. 17-18). As shown by Hendricks, the user makes a selection which requires the server to provide the stored video as required by claim 10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the system of Courtney with the storage system of Hendricks in order to provide additional information not available in the live video.

[claims 11 and 12]

Courtney and Hendricks both teach the use of the internet and networking of system through land lines and wireless means as shown above. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use 802.11 or wireless IP as these are well known networking means in the art (Official Notice).

[claims 13 and 14]

Courtney further teaches the control means wherein the control signals sent by the portable module include camera control signals for controlling the camera (Col 3

Art Unit: 2613

Lines 2-40, Col 5 line 45-Col 6 Line 29, Fig. 3). As shown in Figure 3, the controls include pan (83 and 84), tilt (81 and 82), and zoom (85 and 86) as required by claim 14.

Claims 15-18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courtney and Hendricks as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of US Patent 6,285,398 to Shinsky et al.

[claims 15-18]

Courtney teaches the control of pan, tilt and zoom for a camera as shown above. Courtney and Hendricks do not teach the control of focus, brightness, contrast, and hue. Shinsky teaches the control of the brightness, contrast and hue of a camera through a host computer using a graphical user interface (Col 9 Lines 40-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the system of Courtney and Hendricks with the control means of Shinsky in order to further provide camera controls to adjust the display to the preferences of the user. It would have been further obvious to include control of the focus of the camera as this is a well known parameter used by a user to adjust the display (Official Notice).

[claim 19]

As shown above Courtney, Hendricks and Shinsky teach the multiple number of camera controls provided to a user of a portable module. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use these multiple controls in order to position and focus the camera to present the desired view to the user (Official Notice).

Claim 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courtney and Hendricks as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of US Patent 5,926,209 to Glatt.

Courtney and Hendricks teach the system of claim 13, wherein the user can control the pan (83 and 84), tilt (81 and 82), and zoom (85 and 86) of a camera , as shown in Figure 3. Courtney and Hendricks do not teach the control signals include an encoder configuration controls.

Glatt teaches the use of the control signals for a camera (pan, tilt and zoom), in a surveillance system, to configure the encoder in order to reduce computational and memory overhead required for compression of video data (abstract, Col 1 Lines 64-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the surveillance system of Courtney and Hendricks with the encoder control means of Glatt in order to reduce computational and memory overhead required for compressing the video.

Claims 21, 22, 24 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courtney.

[claims 21 and 22]

As shown above Courtney teaches the surveillance system of claim 1. Courtney further teaches the portable module is a cellphone (46, Fig. 2) (Col 4 Line 19-27). Courtney further teaches a base station (36, Fig.2) used for wireless communication with the portable module through a radio frequency cellular telephone link. Though Courtney teaches only one base station it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

Art Unit: 2613

skill in the art that the connection could be made to any base station on a cellular telephone network in order to provide the cellphone user access to the camera anywhere the cellular service is provided (Official Notice). Further, the telephone network is a well known switching network as required by claim 22.

[claim 24]

Courtney suggest the use of providing the portable unit a decoder in order to provide mpeg-4 video which provides more real-time video information (Col 7 Lines 20-36). Though Courtney does not specifically teach the use of a buffer with the decoder it is well known in the art to provide a buffer with the decoder in order to prevent overflow and underflow of the decoder (Official Notice).

[claim 28]

Courtney further teaches the use of the ancillary component (19) used to inform the base station and further the portable module (Col 6 Lines 38-53).

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courtney as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hendricks.

[claim 23]

Courtney teaches the surveillance system of claim 1. Courtney does not teach the selection of a signal from multiple signals. Hendricks teaches the use of a processor (240, Fig. 9B) in order to determine the capabilities of the users device in order to determine which signal to provide the user (Col 17 Lines 39-44, Fig. 15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

combine the surveillance system of Courtney with the signal selection of Hendricks in order to provide a user with a signal based on the user device's capabilities.

Claims 25-27, 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courtney as applied to claims 24 and 28 above, and further in view of US Patent 6,512,919 to Ogasawara.

[claims 25-27]

Courtney teaches the surveillance system of claim 24. Courtney does not teach the indication of the signal strength. Ogasawara teaches the use of a video phone which provides an indication of the signal strength (Col 7 Line 64-Col 8 Line 17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the signal strength indicator with the portable unit of Courtney as the portable unit of Courtney is a cellphone. It would have further been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the stored info in the buffer for determining signal strength as the buffer contains the signal coming into the cellphone (Official Notice).

[claims 29 and 30]

As shown above, Courtney teaches the surveillance system of claim 28. Courtney does not teach the use of a bar-code scanner or magnetic strip reader. Ogasawara teaches the use of a bar-code reader (20, Fig. 3) and magnetic strip reader (27, Fig. 3) on the portable module for transmitting barcode information to the server in order to process an order for products (Col 5 Lines 30-59, Fig. 1 and 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the

portable unit of Courtney with the bar-code reading system of Ogasawara in order to provide the ability to order supplies from a remote location.

Claims 32 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courtney, Li and Morad as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of US Patent Application Publication 2001/0005684 to Inkinen et al.

[claims 32 and 34]

As shown above Courtney, Li and Morad teach the system of claim 7. Courtney, Li and Morad do not teach the portable unit containing a camera. As shown in Figure 3, Inkinen teaches a similar portable unit which contains a camera (2) to enable the user of the portable unit to video conference between two or several points via telecommunication networks (Paragraphs [0005] and [0024]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the camera of Inkinen with the portable system of Courtney, Li and Morad in order to provide the ability to video conference.

Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courtney, Li, Morad and Inkinen as applied to claim 32 above, and further in view of US Patent 6,675,386 to Hendricks et al.

[claim 33]

As shown above Courtney, Li, Morad and Inkinen teach the surveillance system of claim 32. The server of Courtney (24, Fig. 1) does not specifically show the server adapted for archiving the signals. As shown in Figure 2, Hendricks teaches the digital storage (132) attached to the server (130) for archiving the signals (Col 6 Lines 38-43).

Hendricks further teaches the use of the stored video in order to provide additional information not available in the live video (Col 18 Lines 40-61, Figs. 17-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the system of Courtney, Li, Morad and Inkinen with the storage system of Hendricks in order to provide additional information not available in the live video.

Claims 35-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courtney, Li, and Morad as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of US Patent Application Publication 2001/0026223 to Menard et al.

[claims 35-41]

Courtney, Li and Morad teach the system of claim 7, as shown above. Courtney further teaches the ability to contact the central server regarding an alarm (Col 7 Lines 46-53). Courtney, Li and Morad do not teach the notification signal is any combination of Security Assist, Medical Assist, Fire Assist, Intercom, or Video Intercom. Courtney, Li and Morad further do not teach the multiple notification signal means.

As shown in Figure 1, Menard teaches a portable unit (200) which allows for the notification of a request for Security, Medical and Fire Assistance to a server as required by claims 35 and 36 (Paragraphs [0024], [0025] and [0033]). Menard further teaches the use of pagers and telephones for communication with the user and an end-user (Paragraphs [0010], [0025], [0029]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the portable system of Courtney, Li and Morad with the functions of the portable system of Menard in order to provide a user friendly means for performing emergency requests. It would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 2613

one of ordinary skill in the art to perform different means of contact based on the desired use of the system in which these means could be pagers, telephones, or email (Official Notice).


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Erick Rekstad whose telephone number is 571-272-7338. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on 571-272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Erick Rekstad
Examiner
AU 2613
(571) 272-7338
erick.rekstad@uspto.gov


GIMS PHILIPPE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

